



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION

KAREN VICTORIA HILL, *on behalf of Karen* §
Germain Meadows, deceased, §
Plaintiff, §
§
vs. § Civil Action No. 0:18-3581-MGL
§
ANDREW M. SAUL, *Commissioner of the* §
Social Security Administration, §
Defendant. §
§

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S ACTION WITH PREJUDICE**

This is a Social Security appeal in which Plaintiff Karen Victoria Hill (Hill), proceeding pro se on behalf of the late Karen Germain Meadows (Meadows), seeks judicial review of a final decision of Defendant Andrew Saul (Saul) denying Meadows's claim for Disability Insurance Benefits. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting Hill's action be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court

may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on January 8, 2020. To date, Hill has failed to file any objections to the report. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court Hill’s action is dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 23rd day of March 2020 in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within sixty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.